

### REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 4 and 84 were rejected under the judicially-created Doctrine of Obviousness-type double patenting, the primary reference being United States Patent No. 6,733,852 to *Littlejohn et al.*

The enclosed *Terminal Disclaimer* is believed to attend to the double patenting rejection.

The outstanding §112 rejections were withdrawn; however, the §103 obviousness rejections were all repeated.

At pp. 8-9 of the February 2, 2005 Office Action it was noted that Claim 1 would be allowable if a “laterally extending internal retaining shelf” was moved elsewhere in the Claim and “a base stop ridge” was recited as a component of the recess after the term “comprising” (supported in Applicant’s specification at p. 16, lines 24-27 and in **Figure 7**).

The suggested changes have been made to claims 1, 53 and 84; all of the independent claims in this application.

In view of the above amendments and enclosed *Terminal Disclaimer*, all Claims are believed in condition for allowance.

This Amendment is believed timely filed. If any extensions or fees are necessary, please consider this a *Petition* therefore and charge any fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0935.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael W. Ferrell", written in a cursive style.

Michael W. Ferrell  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 31,158

Ferrells, PLLC  
P.O. Box 312  
Clifton, Virginia 20124-1706  
Telephone: 703-968-8600  
Facsimile: 703-968-5500  
May 3, 2005